20c MARCH 2, 1953

TAXES: THE SPLIT IN THE GOP

New Republic

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE:
THE PERILS OF INDEPENDENCE

SENATOR LISTER HILL on
THE GREAT OIL RUSH OF 1953

Reviews by

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS ***ALLEN TATE***

RICHARD LESTER ***WILLARD THORP***

The Charles C. Bernard Library
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

Who Is A "Good" American?

● Until lately I never wondered whether or not I was a good American. I just thought I was American and let it go at that. Once when I was younger and interested in the matter I tried to check my family tree and I learned that all eight of my great-grandparents were born in this country. So were my grandparents and so were my parents and so was I. . . . So I assumed I was American.

I was born in North Dakota and my family moved around a bit, but always in the United States. I was baptized in the Methodist Church. I went to the public schools, wearing blue jeans, and I played hookey sometimes. . . . My boyhood was just a sum of little details but as I look back at them they seem normal enough to me. My career in the Navy was not heroic or unheroic. And when I got out of the Navy I went back to school, taking advantage of the GI bill. I got two graduate degrees and became a teacher and considered myself sadly underpaid. While in the Navy I got married and had a son. That is about my life. I'm still a teacher.

It all seems ordinary to me. It all seems commonplace American. Yet lately I have begun to wonder about myself and whether or not I really am an American. A good American that is.

For instance, a good American is one who doesn't mind taking an oath every morning before breakfast testifying to what a good American he is. I mind. But because I need a job I signed oaths, losing only a little self-respect in the process. I felt hurt, as though I had been asked to certify that I was not sexually queer, but I signed. But my feelings in this matter seem to be poor American. There are other things, too.

I think President Truman is an honest and courageous man and was a good President, and I think Dean Acheson was a great Secretary of State. And if I were a praying man—which I'm not and an American should be—I would pray every day and all day Sunday for the United Nations, to which, incidentally, I think the United States along with *all* other nations ought to surrender a good deal of sovereignty.

I am in favor of President Truman's health-insurance plan which I do not think is socialized medicine, but I would be even more in favor of socialized medicine.

When the Truman Administration seized the steel mills I cheered and I groaned when the Supreme Court gave them back. . . .

The tidelands veto I praised because I believe that the tidelands should belong to citizens rather than stockholders. As should all our natural wealth.

But I do not agree with all that the New Deal-Fair Deal did. I believe Truman's "security" measures are evil and, if I may borrow an expression, un-American. A man who is accused of disloyalty should know why, and he should know who is accusing him, and he should have a chance to answer.

I believe that Joe McCarthy and his supporters and defenders are a national disaster; I believe that a man named Guiseppe Franconi Pisano can be as good an American as a man named Pat McCarran; I believe that if America keeps on the road she is on she will soon be indistinguishable from other totalitarian states and will not be the country those who profess to love her say they are trying to save . . . .

Am I a good American? Do I forfeit my right to full citizenship because some of my ideas are different from those of others? Am I disloyal? A traitor? Am I unfit to teach my classes? It worries me. . . . I may be naïve and my ideas may show great ignorance—they certainly are voted down. But are they treacherous? Are they disloyal? Are they un-American? What is "American" anyway?

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble. . . . " Could *this* be it?

Dallas, Tex. R. T. G.

Presidential Primaries

● I felt compelled to answer Mr. Miller's advocacy of national Presidential primaries (*NR*, Feb. 9). The arguments against this proposal are seldom heard but very convincing:

1. Less flexible. There would be no opportunity for the consultation and compromise necessary to obtain the most politically suitable candidate.

2. More regulative. The criterion used to determine which ballot a person is going to use would constitute legal dictation of national party membership qualifications.

3. Create apathy. The primary source of American political apathy is the voter's excessive burden. The addition of a national primary would make the electoral process even more complicated than it already is.

Kalamazoo, Mich. CHARLES T. GOODSELL

A Lesson from Ike

● The letter by Constance Reid on Grassrooters (*NR*, Jan. 26) reminds me of the situation in our town during the recent campaign.

In our town, as I imagine in most cities, the Democratic Party and Volunteers for Stevenson each had separate headquarters. The Volunteers were amateurish as were most. Here many workers were college people and my guess is the people they reached were mostly their friends. If Stevenson is nominated in '56 (I think that is what most of us are working for), we must unite

(Continued on page 4)

Bandwagon

Depends on How You Look at It

The former drummer boy, [Albert Woolson, age 106] veteran of the dash for Vicksburg, thinks President Eisenhower is doing a fine job and puts him in the class with General Grant—Mr. Woolson's highest compliment. – *From an AP dispatch.*

That Impersonal Touch

I'm a traveler from way back, and so I've often run into that old problem of whether it's proper to be friendly and talk to your fellow passengers. My answer to this is to suit yourself. . . .

Don't be a nuisance, however. . . . And don't get personal. You can always talk about where he's from, where he's going and what he's going to do when he gets there. – *Ethel Merman writing in* This Week.

Undoubtedly

"Of course, Conant is classified as a great liberal and undoubtedly is not the type some of the committee would have named." – *Sen. Alexander Wiley as quoted in the New York* Times.

The Purge Is On

PARIS: A bust of Russian Prime Minister Stalin was stolen from a Communist Party branch office. Party officials did not say whether any valuables were taken. – *From a UP dispatch.*

A Firm Stand

The second person in line to see Stratton was Nona Nelson, 17, Springfield-Lanphier High School senior and student of journalism.

She talked to Governor Stratton about education. The Governor indicated that he was not opposed to it. – *From the Chicago* Sun-Times.

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – The Editors.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR MARCH 2, 1953

5 Eisenhower versus the Republican Party An Editorial
6 Joseph McCarthy, Secretary of State An Editorial
7 The Week:
7 Velde's Mistake
7 A New Trade Policy?
8 Senate Seats Should Not Be Trophies
9 Stevenson Reassures Europe
10 Wayne Morse: The Peril of Independence, by Robert L. Riggs
12 The Oil Rush of '53 by Lister Hill
14 "Trade Not Aid"—How? by Tom Fitzsimmons
17 Literature and the Arts:
17 Yvor Winters, *Collected Poems*, by Allen Tate
18 Bernard DeVoto, *Course of Empire*, by W. O. Douglas
19 P. Bottome, *Challenge*, and A. A. Milne, *Year In, Year Out*, by Willard Thorp
19 Stendahl's Letters, by I. Rosenfeld
20 Religion and History, by A. Werner
21 Jean Dutourd, *A Dog's Head*, by J. M. Brinnin
21 D. Lilienthal, *Big Business*, by Richard Lester
22 Vladimir Dedijer, *Tito*, by Bruce Bliven
23 On the Sublime, by E. Bentley

EDITOR, Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Tom Fitzsimmons, Arnold J. Heidenheimer (on leave with the Armed Services)
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Drama Critic; Malcolm Cowley; Robert Evett, Music Critic.
CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Dudley Fitts, Kimon Friar, Gerald Johnson, V. O. Key, Max Lerner, Richard Lester, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, James Johnson Sweeney, Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin
COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1953 IN THE USA BY WESTBURY PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1416 F ST., N.W., WASHINGTON 4, D.C. BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49th ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50.

WASHINGTON WIRE

THE EISENHOWER Administration hasn't reached manhood's stature yet, but it is out of its crib. On a dozen fronts reality is breaking through the opium haze of GOP campaign promises. The sooner this happens the better for everybody, for obviously Ike can't shoulder his heart-breaking job otherwise—the job that is so much harder than election speeches indicated.

Let's put down some praise for Ike first. We thought he did a good job at his first press conference. It was a terribly hard ordeal—breaking the ice. He put on a cool, brisk, split-second show. The commercial was too long and the time for reporters' questions too short, but a filibuster was natural in the circumstances. Ike was an attractive, commanding figure who had done his homework. There will be trouble later if reporters don't get more scope, but it was a good beginning.

In our judgment, anyway, Ike is right in taking off most controls. Truman's Council of Economic Advisers in its last report indicated it was about time they came off, for the threat of inflation is almost over. Again on farm prices: the farm lobby is the biggest, most bipartisan and arrogant in Washington. If Ike disregards it, so much the better. Personally we are glad Ike is letting cattle prices sag, and if farmers get a taste of decontrol that is what they ordered in the election.

Having said all this, let us put down a list of developments so far in which reality has broken through the Republican dream world of the 1952 campaign.

1. Ike came back from his election-inspired trip to Korea saying it was a tough problem; this is what Stevenson said all along.

2. The "best brains" turned out to mean millionaire businessmen. They have a lot to learn as politicians as the Charlie Wilson explosion emphasized.

3. The GOP hinted it could cut taxes right away, found it couldn't without unbalanced the budget. The GOP split on taxes has begun.

4. The GOP thought it could balance the budget right away but found it couldn't without slashing either defense or foreign aid. A GOP split on this looms.

5. GOP Congressional leaders came away from the White House last week chagrined over tax cuts—they had just discovered that the world situation is "grim." Democrats tactfully remained silent—they had known it for years.

6. Dulles, in a series of off-the-record chats, is emphasizing the extreme gravity of the global situation. The question: Is it really any worse or is Dulles just finding out what responsibility is like?

7. After scaring Europe over proposals to blockade China the Administration is quickly retreating. In the same way it turns out that the deneutralization of Formosa is little more than what Truman had already countenanced.

8. Rearming Korean divisions to replace US divisions also continues Truman policies. It will cost lots of money (like the proposed aid to French Indo-China) which is something GOP tax-cutters haven't realized yet.

9. Ike has so watered-down the GOP plank to "repudiate" Yalta and Potsdam (and his own campaign speeches and State of the Union address) that Democrats actually hail his proposed condemnation of Russia. It is the die-hard Republicans who threaten revolt.

10. The GOP majority in the House Ways and Means Committee has pigeonholed for this session Ike's proposal for greatly expanded social security.

11. Agriculture Secretary Benson's admonitions to farmers against "give-away government programs" which are "steadily and surely" undermining "moral and spiritual values" are in laughable contrast to the tone of Ike's farm campaign

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speeches supporting the goal not merely of 90-percent parity but "full parity."

12. The dream-promise that Ike would curb McCarthy has, of course, proved absurd. Ike's victory put McCarthy in power. Now the State Department is fawning on him. If Dulles capitulates to McCarthy in the test case of John Carter Vincent, it will be hard to sustain Department morale.

Are the foregoing points put down in malice? Not at all. Only five weeks after Ike took office reality is breaking in as it had to do if this country were to be safe. Ike is carrying forward the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in basic particulars. We prayerfully hope the ruffles and flourishes he is adding won't bring war; maybe they are wise, but it would be absurd to deny they add to the risk.

As to Ike himself, we expect to support him with everything we have on a lot of issues, issues on which we expect his die-hard opponents will be Republicans—men who, in many cases, put him up as a campaign front for their own purposes. We will support Ike on tariff-cutting, foreign aid, above all on the continued need for national sacrifice. We will back him against the newly restated (and cardinal) heresy of Taft that the cost of domestic defense is a greater danger to America than Russia. And we expect to support Ike when he finally ends his disgusting alliance with McCarthy, a break that we deem inevitable and that, when it comes, will mark puberty for the slowly maturing Eisenhower Administration.

Notes: All the kind readers who told us Hell's Canyon is on the Colorado—and not the Snake River (tributary of the Columbia) are thanked—grudgingly. . . . "Socialist" Canada, which runs its own railroad, ships, telegraphs, broadcasting, television, synthetic rubber, grain storage and uranium industries has baby--bonus and old-age laws has also a balanced budget, premium dollar and is now cutting taxes 11 percent; creeping Socialism pays off.

Washington, D. C. T.R.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

(Continued from page 2)

the Volunteer groups with the Democratic Party. With money so hard to come by the rent saved on one Headquarters could be used for campaign purposes. To put it bluntly the "egg heads" had better get it through their "egg heads" that two heads are better than one. After all Stevenson believes in the Democratic Party or he would not run on the ticket. We could take a lesson from Ike on unity (well, he won did he not?). He took all of his party to his bosom and won the election. . . .

Rockford, Ill. CHARLES L. ALLEN

The Liberals' Task

● . . . While Ike is paying off his debt to big business, we liberal Democrats must help pay the debt incurred by the Democratic National Committee during the late campaign.

I was especially impressed by Harold J. Gibbons' "Labor's Task in the Precinct." (*NR*, Jan. 5). I would say our trouble last November could be found right there.

I have found the *New Republic* to be a welcome relief from the 80 percent press. Keep it up.

San Bruno, Calif. JOHN W. MC LAIN

Keeping Stevenson Going

● I, too, want to give financial support to whatever plan is adopted for Mr. Stevenson's use. I have already sent a contribution to the Democratic National Committee to help meet the campaign deficit and now pledge a monthly contribution to a new Stevenson fund if and when it is established.

Jersey City, N. J. BETTY POKLEMBA

[Listed below are the names of others who have expressed a desire to contribute to a Stevenson fund if and when it is established. Those who still desire to send a contribution to the Democratic National Committee to help meet the campaign deficit should address it to the Committee, c/o Dwight Palmer, Treasurer, Ring Building, Washington, D. C. – THE EDITORS.]

Mr. and Mrs. Clifford Blake, Huntington, W. Va.; Mrs. Lore M. Boehler, Cleveland, Ohio; Rebecca P. Elliott, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mary N. Gaither, Greensboro, N. C.; Mrs. Louise Lombardi, San Francisco, Calif.; Gene Marine, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. and Mrs. A. M. Martin, Boise, Idaho; Betty Poklemba, Jersey City, N. J.; Miss Elizabeth Price, Philadelphia, Pa.; Gizella V. Stodola, Hammond, Ind.; Mrs. Clara Sturges Johnson, San Dimas, Calif.

What The World Needs

● The more I reflect, the more I read the mature reflections of others—the more I become convinced of the soundness of President Conant's statement: "The conceptual schemes at the disposal of our anthropologists and psychologists are equivalent of the conceptual schemes used by chemists and physicists of the late 18th century." (In my humble opinion, it is a gross understatement.)

Your symposium "On Stevenson and the Future" (*NR*, Jan. 5) illustrates the point. Lewis Mumford exemplifies the 18th century mentality to perfection. "No other public leader . . . is so well qualified to recall us to our moral senses," says Mr. Mumford. I agree with Mr. Mumford. But, ye gods and little fishes! Is it "to recall us to our moral senses," the world is in need of, or is it not, rather, a 20th century conceptual scheme the world is, subconsciously, in search of, the moral senses of which are a logical corollary! . . .

The quintessence of the 20th century conceptual scheme is the synthesis of technology and the moral senses. The implications and applications are beyond the scope of a letter. However, it can be summed up in one sentence: Jefferson democracy translated and implemented in 20th century terms.

St. Louis, Mo. PHILIP WEISS

"The Fight Against the Filibuster"

● I have just completed a "thorough" reading of Sen. Paul H. Douglas' article "The Fight Against the Filibuster," (*NR*, Jan. 12).

I would like to commend Senator Douglas on such a convincing and, indeed, factual argument he presented in both his article and speech on the Senate floor.

I should like to commend, further, the Senator and the others of the progressive-liberal bloc (Senators Morse, Humphrey, Lehman, Tobey, etc.) for their splendid anti-filibuster endeavor on attempting to permit the will of the majority to triumph in the Senate of the United States—the upper-house, if you will, of the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Alexandria, Va. LEONARD BROWN JR.

ADA

● I notice in recent letters to the editor *NR* readers seem concerned about the future of liberal thinking and the liberal movement in general in this country.

May I remind them of the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization that does not function only during election periods but whose purpose is also to work in every community by sponsoring liberal legislation, whether it concerns schools, taxes, or any other cause in the public interest. . . .

Bloomfield, N. J. MRS. GWEN GOLDSTEIN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 128, NUMBER 9, ISSUE 1996, WASHINGTON, D. C., MARCH 2, 1953 · New Republic

EISENHOWER VERSUS THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

THE LONGEST mile in the world stretches from the White House to Capitol Hill. It measures the reach between the nation's problems and the Republican's pledges.

In the White House Eisenhower briefs the Republican leaders on the responsibilities of power; on Capitol Hill, Representative Reed reminds them of the irresponsibilities by which they gained power. Reason stands with the President; emotion does not. Reed and his friends maintain that a commitment to cut taxes was made and must be honored. If their tax-reduction bill gathers dust then so may three of Eisenhower's 11 "must measures." They are to expand social security, to extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements and to simplify customs laws, and all three must clear through Reed's Ways and Means Committee before they reach the House floor.

Reed and his friends look on high taxes as the symbol of their struggle and the cause of their success. The pressures upon them were indicated on the day that Congress convened, when 85 tax bills were thrown into the hopper. They acknowledged the Republican commitment, unencumbered by Eisenhower's recent reservations, and HR 1 was Chairman Reed's own bill.

Reed's bill provides that the 11-percent individual income-tax increase, set to expire next December 30, be moved up to June 30, to expire together with the excess-profits tax. For hard-pressed citizens, it offered these attractive returns for the verdict of 1952:

Net Income	*1953 Cut*	*1954 Cut*
$3,000	$6.60	$13.20
5,000	28.60	57.20
8,000	64.80	129.60
10,000	90.80	181.60
20,000	248.00	536.00
50,000	1,084.00	2,204.00
100,000	2,032.00	4,120.00
500,000	4,344.00	8,768.00

The Reed bill offers only minor relief to low- and middle-income groups—an approach consistent with Eisenhower's belief that the way to check inflation is by tax and credit policies. Yet it deprives the government of $1.5 to $1.8 billion in revenues in the 1953 tax year. No public hearings were held on the bill; no experts of the Treasury Department were consulted; no estimate of the Administration's proposed expenditures was available. The President, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Budget Director made guarded statements opposing premature tax reductions. But they seemed content to let the bill pass as an idle gesture in the direction of campaign oratory, and then as Speaker Martin remarked, to bottle it up "at least two or three months" while alternative measures are prepared.

What are these alternative measures? Within a few months, tax measures will expire which will deprive the government of $3 billion in individual income taxes in fiscal 1954, $2 billion in corporate income taxes, $2.5 billion in excess-profits taxes, and $1 billion in excise taxes. The pressures upon Eisenhower to let these revenues go are powerful, particularly on the matter of the excess-profits tax. Yet the only alternatives so far considered are the maintenance of the present corporate income-tax rate and an increase in excise taxes. The latter proposal will create as many economic and political problems for the Administration as are solved by the abandonment of present taxes. And neither proposal will begin to be adequate if over-all activity and revenue begin to decline.

Rep. John Taber, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, leads in the view that the solution is to set a sensible ceiling on tax revenues and then to force federal expenses under that ceiling regardless of need. He argues that the Truman budget is "loaded with waste, inefficiency and unnecessary expense." He holds that if we "eliminate the padding and squandering" everything will come out right. That is the official Republican view, and accordingly commission after commission, and task force after task force, all composed exclusively of bankers and other high-income taxpayers, are moving into Washington to destroy the dragons of bureaucracy and set the maiden of business intelligence free.

No one will protest the effort to save through greater efficiency in government. Yet against these possible savings in administration are the certain increases in expenditures on present programs. Government purchases of farm products will increase as prices sag. Even if we lay aside economic development and the Point Four program, military outlays alone are below military commitments. Deliveries of armaments to Europe will have to increase if schedules already halved are not to be further cut. And Eisenhower's rule that Asians should

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fight Asians will mean not a lesser but a greater effort as we undertake to equip and support new armies in South Korea, Formosa, Indo-China and Japan. The "disengaging" of American troops, to which so many campaign promises are pinned, will be accomplished only by the extension of military guarantees and the placing of larger forces in reserve, which can give them meaning.

This program in full may be beyond Eisenhower's grasp. Even in part it will seem to Taber, Reed and their supporters to amount to the betrayal by Eisenhower of their lifelong struggle. Nor are they entirely to blame. Their lives have been shaped by opposition, and all opposition tends to breed irresponsibility. The same pressures now drive the Democrats toward irresponsibility, toward the feeling that the Republicans should get what they deserve, and that if events go badly in Trieste, Taipeh or Tonkin, that is Eisenhower's concern. On the contrary, because it is the nation that will suffer, the task is to help Eisenhower on this issue as he attempts to dig himself out of his party's sorry past.

JOSEPH McCARTHY, SECRETARY OF STATE

BRAVE WORDS were voiced by the President in his State of the Union message. "Primary responsibility for keeping out the disloyal and dangerous rests squarely upon the executive branch," he declared. "When this branch so conducts itself as to require policing by another branch of the government it invites its own disorder and confusion." Lippmann and others hailed these words as the dawn of a new day. But before the sun rose on the new day, a darkness settled deeper than any we have known.

There are more ways than one to skin the federal government. Congressional encroachment may be *required* by supposed softness toward subversion; it can and has been *invited* by the craven cowardice shown by Eisenhower's top advisers in surrendering to McCarthy.

In keeping with his character, McCarthy has employed the powers of subpoena conferred upon him by Eisenhower's victory against Eisenhower's Department of State. He moved in a realm where grave questions may be asked and major policies reviewed. Instead, he unearthed a dissatisfied file clerk, happy to hint that sinister motives lay behind routine actions in stripping government files. A minor security officer jumped at the occasion afforded to him to charge that damaging files had been mysteriously destroyed. When the hearings moved to Foley Square, a Voice of America news chief was ready to report that his colleagues were "weakening" his anti-Communist radio scripts. And a girl who once wrote book reviews for foreign broadcasts offered testimony on the morals of Voice officials so appalling that McCarthy forbade free discussion before children on TV.

Crippled, as always, intermediate officials set out to defend themselves. They pointed out that the witnesses were malcontents, previously cited for incompetence, that the testimony of the news chief was inaccurate, that of the book reviewer nonsensical and that the files referred to were not destroyed. They noted the simple, vital point: that policy-making officials are employed to make policy and that if their right to make policy is destroyed order collapses and anarchy results.

So the intermediate officials attempted to defend the government. But they in return cut down by the highest officials responsible to Eisenhower.

First, a directive protecting subordinate Department officials who declined to talk to Congressional staff investigators was rescinded on McCarthy's order.

Second, the subordinate security official, transferred when the demoralization of his division became paralyzing was reinstated on McCarthy's insistence, despite the conflicting testimony of his superior.

Third, a directive judging books on content, recommended by the experts and leading citizens of the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, was rescinded on McCarthy's demand. The avowed targets were the historical novels of Howard Fast. But the long record made by McCarran and McCarthy makes it clear the aim is to shut out from every government program all authors and periodicals critical of "Murderers Row."

Never in all his career has McCarthy won such victories at the expense of the government, and never more cheaply. By Eisenhower's surrender, McCarthy is installed as America's shadow Secretary of State.

Far better that he should be Secretary, to bear the consequences of his evil doing! For where does our strength lie in combatting Communist dictatorship? Surely in the manner in which truth and wisdom are made available to those charged with making decisions, and in the orderly processes by which initiative and courage are rewarded, and ability brought to the top. All these are destroyed when, as today, critical power over government personnel is placed beyond the government and in the hands of a man without any redeeming quality to match his insatiable ambition. Only Eisenhower can intervene to undo the damage. If he fails, he may look back on his electoral excursion to Wisconsin as a point of no return on the road to hell.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WEEK

VELDE'S MISTAKE

The new chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee shows promise of being even more reckless than his most prominent predecessors, Martin Dies and J. Parnell Thomas. Rep. Harold Velde, caught in a case of mistaken identity, took two days to admit his error and then weakly placed the blame on an underling on his Committee staff. When Mrs. Agnes Meyer, the highly respected wife of the owner of the Washington *Post*, stoutly criticized the ability and moral integrity of Velde, McCarthy and Jenner, the House Un-American Activities chairman quickly pulled out his dossier on the lady. In his haste, he released to the press a letter Mrs. Meyer was alleged to have written in 1947, praising the Russians. Mrs. Meyer, of course, was not the author of the letter (a photostat of which shows clearly that it was written by a Mrs. G. S. Mayer of Port Clements, B. C.), and Representative Velde was asked to retract his statement. He would not, he said, until he had investigated the matter himself. Finally, he admitted his error and promised he would take "disciplinary action" against the committee employee who gave him the information.

This tactic of making accusations before examining the facts was just what Mrs. Meyer was criticizing in her address to the American Association of School Administrators. She berated the Republican 83rd Congress for increasing the budget of Senator McCarthy's investigating committee, saying:

> This is inexcusable when we consider that a committee of Congress has presented serious evidence against McCarthy that impugns his honesty, his moral integrity and therefore his right to retain his seat in the Senate. Before Senator McCarthy is allowed to investigate anyone else, would it not be more appropriate for the Senate to investigate McCarthy? For his record as an investigator is shameful. He has accused innocent people of Communism on mere hearsay evidence. He is traducing our American principle of law that a man is presumed innocent until proven guilty. . . . Even those admirers of McCarthy who insist that his purposes are good, must concede that he vitiates them with evil means.

On the day that Mrs. Meyer spoke, Sen. William Jenner and Representative Velde were holding hearings as part of their investigations into "subversive influences in the educational process." Mrs. Meyer reminded the educators that it was Jenner "who descended to the lowest depths of the gutter" when he called General Marshall "a living lie." Mrs. Meyer asked: "If this Senator lends himself to the slander of a prominent, beloved and respected citizen like General Marshall, how can any defenseless educator expect justice at his hand?"

As to Velde, Mrs. Meyer questioned his "IQ" on the basis of his record as an investigator, pointing out that last year Velde attempted to order the Librarian of Congress to mark all the subversive matter in the Library, which contains over nine million volumes. His bill never reached the floor for obvious reasons.

Mrs. Meyer's open attack on the Republican Party's chief Congressional investigators took them off balance, especially since the Washington *Post* supported General Eisenhower.

The accusations, lies and half-truths which the McCarthy, Jenner and Velde trio are adept at tossing about under the protection of Congressional immunity are brought forcefully to public attention when so respected a critic as Mrs. Meyer is the victim.

A NEW TRADE POLICY?

President Eisenhower's decision against raising pipe tariffs is an important and hopeful development. Often in his campaign speeches the President seemed to align himself with the reciprocal-trade concept implemented in the early '30s by Cordell Hull, rather than with the Old Guard concept of protectionism. The present temporary decision reinforces that alignment.

Only about 1,600 persons are engaged in this country's pipe industry, which is considered relatively inefficient. Consequently, when under a Republican-made loop-hole in the Reciprocal Trade Agreement the American Smoking Tobacco Manufacturers Association applied for tariff increases ranging up to 76 percent on briar pipes, the request became a test case. Since granting this request would have indicated willingness to protect an unimportant domestic industry at the expense of industries important to allied nations, it would have loosed a barrage of demands for higher tariffs on other products.

As both the CIO and the AFL emphasized, pipe-making in France, for example, employs many workers; higher tariffs here would cause serious unemployment there. And aside from economic ramifications, a decision for protectionism would brutally cut at the morale of nations which no longer want our bounty and ask only to compete with us on a basis of quality and price, at least in areas unimportant to our domestic economy. If the present temporary decision becomes permanent and is the first step in a consistent policy, President Eisenhower will have considerably strengthened the alliances upon which survival of the free-world depends. The President has until June 30, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreement expires, to shape such a policy and to convince the Taft-led Congress it must be implemented. If the Agreement expires or is extended in its present loopholed form, he will have failed. Even extension in its original unriddled state will be partial failure. A new concept is required, one incorporating the minimum provisions outlined by Henry Ford II: " . . . drop the Smoot-Hawley tariff and the now outmoded Reciprocal Trade Agreement . . . abandon completely the quota system . . . abandon the Buy American Act . . . enact promptly a workable law for simplifying customs procedures."

Some of these provisions should be effected gradually; even to get them considered, President Eisenhower will have to wrestle mightily with his party. The trial will be one of strength and leadership. We wish him luck!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SENATE SEATS SHOULD NOT BE TROPHIES!

OREGON is the first state in which a United States Senator ever was chosen by popular vote. Until Jonathan Bourne Jr. won an advisory referendum in Oregon in 1906, all US Senators since George Washington's era had been appointed by state legislatures. Oregon demonstrated that the ballot box was a better instrumentality for staffing the upper branch of Congress. This led to the seventeenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, providing for the direct election of Senators. Now we believe Oregon should set another momentous precedent.

We see no reason why a Governor should be able to reverse a decision of the voters concerning the general policies they wish voiced in the US Senate. The Oregon Senate has recently enacted a bill by a vote of 26 to three ordering that any vacancy must go to the political party which originally won that particular Senate term through election. This will prevent a Governor from looking upon a Senatorial seat as a trophy to be added to the hunting collection of his own party.

At the time the Eisenhower cabinet was announced, news stories declared that the incoming President had to rule out several Republican Senators because they came from states with Democratic Governors. He could hardly risk disturbing the delicate balance in the Senate. But why should a Governor have the authority to cancel out a mandate at the polls? Is this not trusting to caprice the continuity which should thread through political tenure until another decision by the voters?

In making Senatorial appointments, few Governors feel under any genuine compulsion to follow the will of the people, if it means offending the boys in the central committee of the Governor's political party. "To the survivors belong the spoils" is a poor test for deciding membership in the foremost parliamentary body of the leading nation of the free world.

When a vacancy exists in the US House of Representatives, the Governor of the state must call a special election. But when a Senator dies or resigns, a Governor not only never summons the voters to fill this infinitely more important vacancy, but he even can ignore completely the mandate of the people at a recent election. This was shown in Idaho after a Democrat named Bert H. Miller had unseated Republican Sen. Henry C. Dworshak in 1948. Within 11 months Miller, the victor at the polls, was dead of a heart attack. On October 14, 1949, Governor C. A. Robins, a Republican, appointed to the US Senate the man whom the voters had lately rejected, Henry C. Dworshak.

But is it constitutional to fetter a Governor's pen when he is signing a Senatorial commission? Can he be compelled by law to pick a successor of the same political party as that of the man or woman who was elected to the seat in the first place?

Eminent legal authorities in Oregon think our law squares with the Constitution. They cite the phrasing of Amendment XVII which provides that "the legislature of any state may empower the executive thereof to make temporary appointments until the people fill the vacancies by election as the legislature may direct." They claim this language affords generous latitude for a legislature to require that the party thread remain unbroken in Senatorial selections. But how often are the Senators from a state at variance politically with the Governor? After all, these officials are responsible to the same electorate. Is a split in party allegiance ever likely?

Even after a political landslide such as that of November, 1952, a number of situations exist in which a Governor of one party could conceivably have the right to appoint as many as two Senators of the other party.

Washington State and New Mexico each has a Republican Governor and a pair of Democratic US Senators. Michigan and Ohio each has a Democratic Governor and two Republicans in the Senate. And there are various states where at least one Senator is of the opposite affiliation from that of the man in the Statehouse—New York, Arizona, Kentucky and Colorado, for example. These situations will tend to multiply as the Democrats eventually regain popular favor.

Nearly all politicians think of proposed reforms in intimate terms. "What's in it for me?" is a frequent conjecture in the marble chambers of capitol buildings. This occasionally makes it easier for a suggestion like this one to be considered in Republican Oregon than in a state where competition between the parties is sterner.

Yet many ideas first tested in Oregon have spread far and wide. These ideas include the initiative and referendum and recall, the Australian ballot, corrupt-practices legislation and the direct election of Senators.

True, everything in life is *Deo volente*. But if the Republicans are to lose their slender control of the United States Senate, it should be through the people speaking at the ballot box and not because of the strategic location of one or two blood clots.

RICHARD AND MAURINE NEUBERGER

Mr. and Mrs. Neuberger, who serve respectively as State Senator and State Representative from Multnomah County, constitute 15 percent of the Democratic strength in the Oregon legislature.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

STEVENSON REASSURES EUROPE

EUROPEAN respect for Adlai Stevenson's wisdom and courage was confirmed and increased by his comment on the danger of using dollar diplomacy on behalf of European unification. The Democratic leader's warning was both timely and to the point. Moreover, if it was politically useful as an authoritative expression of liberal opinion in the US, it was even more useful, psychologically, in Europe as a corrective to wild and frightened ideas. No one better than Stevenson could make plain that though most of his countrymen agree about the desirability of some form of European unity, far from all accept either the dollar or the *diktat* (or both) as the best method of US encouragement to achieve it.

The fact needed to be made plain. According to the London Sunday *Times*, Secretary Dulles presented two different faces to Europeans during his blitz tour. In private, in his talks with top political leaders and big businessmen, he was "reasonable, understanding, persuasive." In public, to the people at large, he gave the "impression of brandishing a big stick and grossly oversimplying the European federal problem."

Though there were denials later on that the Secretary of State had delivered formal ultimatums on ratification of the European Defense Community before the next NATO meeting in April, the idea cropped up again in the first big speech he made after his return to the US. If the big businessmen in the Eisenhower cabinet really think that US dollars have already "hired" affirmative votes on the EDC in the Paris and Bonn Parliaments, or if they think the "big stick" can get them, the mortgage on effective European unification isn't likely to be lifted quickly, easily or pleasantly.

As a matter of fact, the mortgage will grow heavier, unless Stevenson and men who think as he does are able to influence US foreign policy. In common with Stevenson, most non-Communists in Western Europe favor European unification. They are committed to close ties with the US, on Asian as well as European policies.

Yet, as the London *Times* points out, "Within the Atlantic alliance, international relations and collective policies are in an unusually mobile and formative state." The reason is the effect of what many Europeans call "unilateral repudiationism" and "unilateral liberationism."

The Marquess of Reading referred in the House of Lords to the US repudiation of Yalta as an "impromptu interpolation without representation." There was laughter; but the British official refusal "to depart from international agreements" and to countenance Japanese efforts to repudiate the Dulles Peace Treaty provisions about Southern Sakhalin and the Kuril presents an Anglo-American situation which is no laughing matter.

High Commissioner Conant's statement in Bonn that the US has no intention of repudiating Potsdam did not dismiss Dulles' talk about the "peaceful" reunification of Germany. Nor did it remove the effect of Eisenhower's personal letter to Konrad Adenauer, the only one to a European statesman, suggesting that Christian Democratic (Catholic) West Germany is GOP America's "chosen instrument."

There is, nevertheless, a basis for Dulles' confidence that the EDC may be ratified. Armed with Eisenhower's support, Adenauer may ram it through Parliament. Premier Mayer, a big banker who understands big business, may get enough backing from like-minded (and pocketed) men in the French National Assembly, on the basis of a package deal, involving Indo-China, North Africa, the Saar, off-shore (and other) orders. The danger would come afterward. Maurice Duverger writes:

> The European governments would be unable to prevent the growth within their own countries of mounting opposition. These internal divisions would aggravate in proportion as American policy showed itself more independent of European worries. Thus there would be started a movement of dislocation of the Atlantic pact, which would weaken the security of the US as well as of Europe.

Though GOP Washington doesn't tire of repeating that there is no alternative to the EDC, the implications of the threatened "rethinking" of US policy point in the same direction as "reconsideration" of French policy, and to a lesser extent West German, too. This is away from federation to confederation; from a single, fused European army toward an alliance of national armies, including a German Wehrmacht, British "technical" participation, a Spanish army linked through the US rather than NATO, a Yugoslav army linked with Greece and Turkey rather than Italy.

The men on the Right, General de Gaulle, Pierre-Etienne Flandin and others, say the EDC would be "the suicide of France" because the fused army would eventually and inevitably be dominated by Germany, the chosen instrument of GOP America. It would be the instrument of an axis of power running from Washington to Tokyo through Bonn, Rome and Madrid. Such men don't speak for those Frenchmen who, in the apt phrase of Sean O'Faolain, are "ferociously, even suicidally, libertarian." In domestic politics they are, or tend to be, reactionary. They prefer a separate, independent national French army, even if eventually weaker than the German, because they fear "unilateral liberationism" internationally, on behalf of the non-French purposes of the new power axis; and they believe that a French national army might get a vote or a veto in the making of policy.

Thus the GOP dollar-*diktat* route to European unification threatens on the one hand to lose the friendship of the European peoples and on the other hand to associate the United States people with men who take the "liberation" of Eastern Europe as a policy closing the era of Western European democracy that began with the liberation in 1945.

Paris PERCY WINNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WAYNE MORSE: THE PERIL OF INDEPENDENCE

by Robert L. Riggs

WAYNE MORSE is a hard man when he deals with conservatives and reactionaries of the Republican Party. But the treatment they get from the independent Oregon Senator is mild compared to the scourging he has been giving the chamber's liberal Democrats and Republicans ever since they stood by and watched Robert A. Taft dislodge Morse from two important committees.

Morse is putting quotation marks around "liberal" these days. He has served notice on Lister Hill that the Alabama Democrat need not expect Morse to attend any more Monday night meetings of Senate "liberals" until they begin to act in a manner which won't require quotation marks around the term.

A man with a sardonic sense of humor, Morse is getting considerable satisfaction out of the sleepless nights he has caused some of his long-time friends, whom he now calls "gutless wonders" to their faces.

There is many a bad conscience in the Senate as a result of the transaction by which Morse was tossed off the Armed Services Committee, which has almost as much to do with foreign policy as does the Foreign Relations Committee, and off the Committee on Labor and Education, which will rewrite the Taft-Hartley Act.

In his blunt way, Morse has told his Democratic friends that they were bribed to side with Taft against him. Had enough Senators voted to put Morse back on those two committees, in defiance of the decision of the Republican caucus, there would have had to be a complete reshuffling of assignments both for Democrats and Republicans. So, says Morse, the Democratic liberals sold him out when the test came because, in order to protect the Democratic caucus list of committeemen, they had to accept the Republican decision to dump Morse. As a result only five Democrats voted to uphold Morse's right to continue on Armed Services and on the Labor Committee. Inasmuch as only Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire, stuck with Morse on the Republican side, he took a beating of 81 to seven.

One of the Democrats who dared to vote with Morse got a rebuke from Minority Leader Lyndon Johnson. The party leader told Russell Long, of Louisiana, that it was ungrateful of him to vote against the decision of the Democratic caucus, after the leadership had given him the prize of a place on the Finance Committee.

Robert L. Riggs, a vetern political reporter, is chief of the Washington bureau of the Louisville Courier-Journal.

As a man who can take it as well as dish it out, Morse wasn't greatly disturbed about being heaved off the committees. What is making him so rough with the Democratic liberals is the fact that his enemies back in Oregon are using against him the fact that only five Democrats and one Republican stood with him. They are saying, in his home state: "You see, not only is this man despised by good Republicans, but even the Democratic New Dealers want no part of him."

Morse is reserving his special contempt for the Kentucky Republican who made a liberal record when he served a two-year Senate hitch during the 80th Congress, John Sherman Cooper. It was Cooper who fell heir to the Republican seat on Armed Services after Morse was jerked out of it. Morse feels that he made some contribution to Cooper's election last fall and that of all Senate liberals, the Kentuckian was the one who should have stood with Morse. "Phony" is the word Morse uses for Cooper. He feels he was entitled to expect the support of 15 Republicans and 25 Democrats, which, even had he lost the committee fight, would have been an endorsement from the people he likes to stand with. The Democrats who voted with him, in addition to Long, were Clinton P. Anderson, New Mexico; Estes Kefauver, Tennessee; and the two Senators from West Virginia, Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

Among the Democrats who did not vote for Morse, Herbert Lehman has tried unsuccessfully to get Morse to take the place on the Labor Committee which Lehman holds. Stuart Symington, of Missouri, who might have lost his place on Armed Services if the Democratic caucus list had been upset, has taken occasion to let Morse know he feels the committee would have been better served if the Oregon Senator had retained his seat.

There are two current perils concerning Morse's standing before the country. One is that, despite his lively sense of humor, he will develop a persecution complex as a result of the treatment he himself invited by his independence. The second is that newspaper reporters, frequently wearied by Morse's lengthy dissertations, will paint a picture of him as a screwball, a nut, an exhibitionist intoxicated by the sound of his own voice.

Such a picture would be highly erroneous. The tough operators of the Republican side of the aisle, Taft and his chief lieutenant, Eugene Millikin, recognize Morse not only as part of their permanent obstacle course but also

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as one of the best-informed Senators in the US Senate.

The Democrats' bad conscience arises, in part, from the fact that Morse made an intensive campaign for Adlai E. Stevenson, a man he has not met to this day unless he encountered him in Washington during the past weekend.

Although Morse bolted Dwight D. Eisenhower last fall, he had been one of the first among Republican Senators to advocate the General's nomination. Of course, Eisenhower is not the first Presidential candidate Morse has embraced and then divorced. In 1947, he was an ardent admirer of Harold E. Stassen. But, in 1948, he came to the conclusion that Stassen was motivated entirely by political expediency. Only last month, he poured his contempt upon Stassen when the name of the former Governor of Minnesota was up for confirmation as Mutual Security Administrator.

His first doubts about Eisenhower came a few months before last summer's national convention. They were occasioned by reports about the General's "chief-of-staff complex," reports brought back by Republican emissaries who had visited him in Paris. Despite these doubts, Morse worked hard at Chicago for Eisenhower's nomination. He was bitterly disappointed, he says, when Eisenhower was willing to accept the "shocking platform" presented to the convention by a platform committee from which Morse had been carefully excluded.

Little Man, What Next?

From the San Diego Union

An exhibit from the current newspaper campaign to discredit Morse.

Morse wanted to make a floor fight for a better platform, he says, but the leaders of the Eisenhower campaign feared that if they joined him in that effort, they would lose certain conservative-minded delegates. "It then dawned on me for the first time," said Morse, "that Eisenhower was not above political expediency." The Oregon liberal's next disillusionment was Eisenhower's insistence that Richard M. Nixon receive the Vice-Presidential nomination. Morse had been trying to bring about the nomination of Sen. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, as a man upon whom liberals and conservatives could compromise. "You could have knocked me over with a feather," Morse said, "when two of Eisenhower's emissaries came to me and said that he was very much opposed to having anyone but Nixon."

For all his disillusionments, Morse left Chicago convinced still that a Republican victory was vital to the welfare of the country. He volunteered to campaign anywhere the Republicans wanted him to go.

Before the campaign got under way, Morse set out in August for England, along with Russell Long, on their now-famous inspection of Air Force bases. He says he was shocked at the evidence he found in NATO installations there of Eisenhower's "lack of competence." "I heard many serious criticisms of Eisenhower," he said. "Many who had worked with him considered him to be just plain dumb, and regarded him as a man whose idea of compromise was to do the expedient thing, irrespective of what principles might be sacrificed in doing it." For all that, when Morse returned to this country in September, he still planned to campaign for Eisenhower. "But," he said, "I began listening to Stevenson, whom I had never met. As I listened to his speeches and compared them with the demagoguery of Eisenhower's speeches, I realized that a dramatic and historic thing was taking place in the United States—a brilliant statesman was running for the Presidency for the Democrats, and a demagogue, who was obviously willing to commit any expedient act for support, was running for the Republicans. Every speech of Eisenhower's keenly disappointed me. I soon found myself in the midst of a terrible conflict of conscience. As I talked to Eisenhower's emissaries as they came to see me, I came to recognize that Eisenhower's campaign was completely lacking in political morality."

One of those emissaries who argued with Morse was his former hero, Harold Stassen. "He sat across my desk, in that chair you are occupying," Morse said, "and asked me when I was going to wake up to the realities of politics. Do you wonder I said on the Senate floor that Stassen was guided entirely by political expediency?"

The first decision Morse made was that he would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely "stroll" out of the campaign—that is, although he would make no speeches for Eisenhower, he would not do anything against him. Soon, however, he felt impelled to take the stump for Stevenson. And, because he had criticized Joseph H. Ball in 1944 for bolting Thomas E. Dewey without leaving the party, he announced his departure from the Republican fold. But he did not seek shelter in the Democratic tent. "My speeches for Stevenson consisted for the most part of answering the big-lie technique that Eisenhower resorted to time and time again," Morse said.

"Of course, his most notorious abuse of intellectual honesty was set forth in his Detroit speech, when he lied to the American people as to who was responsible for taking the troops out of South Korea in 1949. He forgot to tell the American people in that speech that he, along with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, joined in a unanimous recommendation on September 26, 1947, recommending that the troops be taken out of South Korea as a matter of military policy.

"He also misrepresented the recommendations of the Wedemeyer report by taking out of context an excerpt from the report, thereby leaving the impression with the American people that Wedemeyer had been against taking the troops out of Korea. The fact is that Wedemeyer, at the time, was not opposed to taking troops out of Korea, but agreed with the policy of taking them out.

"When I read Eisenhower's Detroit speech, I called President Truman on the telephone and pointed out to him how Eisenhower had lied the night before in Detroit.

"However, Truman was already aware of it, and was as shocked by it as I was. I then told Truman that there was a document down in the Pentagon which would prove that Eisenhower had engaged in the big-lie technique; and I told him if he would make that document available to me, I would prove to the American people that Eisenhower had misrepresented the facts in his Detroit speech.

"Truman made that document available to me, and with that authority, I announced in my Minneapolis speech that Eisenhower had resorted to the big-lie technique in the Detroit speech, and I proved it from the document.

"As you can well imagine, it was very upsetting to the General. He thought he was protected by secrecy; and he and his cohorts did not like it a little bit because the document had been made available to me.

"His Detroit speech left no room for doubt in my mind as to the kind of man he is. I have absolutely no confidence in him and I am satisfied he is completely lacking in all political morality. In my judgment, he is the most dangerous man who will ever have been in the White House."

Morse's confidence that Eisenhower's political stock will plunge makes him optimistic about his own chances for re-election in 1956. Although he belongs to no party, he can win a place on the Oregon ballot if a convention of 250 people places him in nomination.

THE OIL RUSH OF '53

by Lister Hill

IF INVADING armies were poised off the coasts of the United States to plunder the rich oil deposits under those waters, the entire nation would be mobilized to repel the seizure. Today the American people stand in very real danger of losing billions of dollars of undersea oil reserves, but not from foreign armies with cocked guns. The danger lies in the efforts of California, Texas and Louisiana—backed by big oil interests—to take for themselves vast oil wealth under the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled three times—once in 1947 and twice in 1950—that these oil-rich submerged coastal lands beyond the low-tide mark (going out to sea as far as 150 miles into the Gulf in some places) belong to the United States as a whole—that is, to all the people of the 48 states—and are not the property of the three adjoining states. Yet the Senate and the House will soon vote on bills to overrule the Supreme Court and have the nation give away 16 million acres or more of oil-rich undersea lands to the three states—to the exclusion of the other 45 states.

Lister Hill, Democrat, is Senior US Senator from Alabama.

The oil lobbyists around Capitol Hill are confident of passage of the oil-grab measure by the Republican Congress (after all, Democratic Congresses passed similar bills twice before), and they only hope their presence will speed action. This time there will be no Harry Truman to veto the measures.

Never have measures before Congress been so misrepresented as these so-called tidelands oil bills. The very name "tidelands" is a misrepresentation, for actually the tidelands were not involved in any way in the legislation, just as they were not involved in the Supreme Court decisions. The "tidelands" properly described are those narrow strips of land along the coast that are regularly covered and uncovered by the tides, that is, the lands between the points of high and low tide. The tidelands belong to the individual states and always have. So also do the states hold undisputed title to the beds of inland

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

waters such as rivers, bays, harbors and lakes, including the Great Lakes, and to harbor facilities like piers, docks and jetties.

I do not believe the American people want Congress to overrule our highest court and give away their national inheritance as is proposed by several quitclaim bills now up for consideration. The question that should concern Congress is not how to give the oil and gas away, but how to keep it and use it in the national interest. This vast national patrimony belongs to the people of the entire nation and must be used for their benefit and the benefit of succeeding generations.

For this reason, 22 of us in the Senate are sponsoring legislation to defeat this attempted grab of national property and save it for the school children of America. Our proposal is known as the Oil for Education Amendment. It would dedicate the royalties from the oil and gas to urgent national defense needs and as a perpetual endowment for grammar schools, high schools and colleges throughout the nation—in every one of the 48 states. This is the same wise policy that our nation has followed since the very beginning—a policy of using our public-lands resources to promote education.

The Ordinances of 1785 and 1787 and the Morrill Act of 1862—signed into law by the Republican Party's own Abraham Lincoln—and other Acts of Congress have granted millions of acres of our public lands to the states for the establishment and support of schools and colleges. The challenge to this generation is that we have the wisdom to use our new "public lands" under the sea to give to that system the high standards of quality that Jefferson, Madison, Lincoln and other statesmen of our early history envisioned.

Our measure is exceedingly generous to the coastal states in allocating to them 37.5 percent of the revenues deriving from lands under the sea within the three-mile limit. Our amendment deals with the balance of the revenues—62.5 percent within the three-mile limit and 100 percent beyond the three-mile limit going out to sea. The provisions of the amendment are simple:

1. The money from this oil is to be dedicated now for the long-range needs of the education of the nation's children and placed in a special account in the Treasury of the United States. During the present critical period, the funds may be used for national defense purposes. They shall be employed only for urgent developments to be specifically determined by the Congress. Thereafter, this special account shall be devoted to our children's education as grants-in-aid to primary, secondary and higher education.

2. Every state or political subdivision which has issued any mineral leases or grants covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and every grantee of such state or political subdivision shall file with the Attorney General of the US by December 31, 1953, a statement of the money or other things of value received by the state from such leases or grants. The Attorney General must submit those statements to Congress not later than February 1, 1954. The object of this provision is to find out what benefit particular states have already had from this property which belongs to all the people.

There is no need to emphasize the deplorable conditions that exist in our educational system—dilapidated schools, many of which are overcrowded, the alarming shortage of teachers, underpaid and overworked. And now, while we are facing a national need for more teachers, scientists, engineers, doctors and agriculturists, our colleges and universities are in dire financial trouble. Now that the scholarship aid to World War II veterans is coming to an end, colleges are suffering their most severe financial crisis of all times.

The opportunity which our undersea oil wealth offers to education is seen in a resolution passed by the Arizona House of Representatives on February 9, calling on Congress to adopt the Oil for Education Amendment. I hope that other state legislatures will be quick to follow Arizona's lead. We could strengthen and revitalize American education with this new $50 billion endowment.

Geologists estimate that there are at least 15 billion barrels of oil under the marginal sea and the Continental Shelf. At the going price of around $2.70 per barrel, this adds up to over $40 billion. In addition, there is natural gas worth $10 billion or more. I have frequently told my colleagues in the Senate that adoption of the Oil for Education Amendment would be like placing an oil well on every school and college campus in the US.

Today the government has a huge debt. Taxpayers are carrying heavy burdens. Here is oil money for schools without taxes—a windfall for easing the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools. Here is a bonanza for relieving the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools and research institutions by techniques such as scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. The possibilities challenge the imagination.

To my sore disappointment, President Eisenhower during the campaign last fall told the people of Texas, California and Louisiana that he would sign the kind of bill that Truman vetoed. With all due respects to the President, I must express the earnest hope that Congress never gives him the chance.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"TRADE NOT AID"—HOW?

by Tom Fitzsimmons

On February 17, Henry Ford II urged elimination of US tariffs and all other US barriers to world trade. He asked for an increase of from $5 to 6 billion worth of foreign goods per year, thus raising the value of imports to about five percent of our national income. His speech reflected a slowly growing realization among farm, business and financial leaders that constantly declining US exports point to but one conclusion: Our living standard, that of Europe and the Commonwealth, and our joint ability to satisfy the fiercely presented human demands of Southwest Asia, the Middle East, and the entire African continent, all are threatened by the failure to find a long-term solution to the dollar problem.

Our exports since 1945 total some $45 billion more than do our imports. The simple consequence is that we have been forced to supply some $40 billion of aid to help pay for these exports. Tax money. The remaining gap has been closed largely by shipments of gold with the result of so shrinking dollar reserves of debtor nations that they must restrict imports from us. More, the escape clauses we inserted into the Reciprocal Trade Agreement have caused most nations to plan retaliatory measures. The Battle Act has cut off many nations from their natural and historic markets in Eastern Europe and Asia. They must find substitute markets, especially as German and Japanese goods come more and more into competition for those which remain. We, unfortunately, have not supplied that market. Since 1937 our production has doubled, our exports have more than doubled, ranging up to 180 percent above the '37 level, but our imports have only risen by some 26 percent. And, where we once found 30 percent of our total imports in Europe, the figure is now 18 percent while Europe takes 33 percent of our exports. In short, our policies have put such a strain upon the Western world's commercial relations that something is bound to crack. If the rupture comes, diminishing trade will bring spreading unemployment and political unrest into a world of potential plenty.

The sum total of all these factors is that Europe is fed up with aid and wants trade—wants a long-range solution substituted for stop-gap measures. Indeed, the realization that a creditor nation must have an expanding trade if its economy is to be soundly supported is causing even such US interests as the National Association of Manufacturers to agitate for revision of our policies.

There are strategic and political as well as economic reasons for a more liberal trade policy. Persisting as it has for six years, the dollar problem poses a serious threat to the political and military unity of the free world. Such organizations as the North Atlantic Alliance will become increasingly difficult to hold together, and new alliances increasingly impossible to form, unless we provide them with a firm economic foundation. Our failure to do so—indicated by a dollar gap of between $4.5 and $6.5 billion a year—is the result of throwing up desperately needed stopgaps and not using the time gained to find more permanent and basic solutions.

Originally our aid measures—Lend-Lease settlements, UNRRA, the British loans—emphasized the economic stability of Europe. During the Marshall Plan years from 1947 to 1950 our goal became more political and strategic. The aim of the present Mutual Security Program is even more exclusively political and strategic.

Yet Britain, France and Italy still struggle with severe economic crises. And while it is true that each individual nation is responsible for the bulk of the effort to stabilize its economy, it is equally true that there is a point where such efforts are frustrated by the dollar gap.

On the other hand, unless we make intelligent use of the time we have, we will be threatened with a recession when defense spending diminishes after 1953. This need not happen. As Adlai E. Stevenson said not long ago "beyond our shores there is beckoning the vast demand for goods and skills of huge areas. . . ." For example, equipment which would allow them to produce more, more cheaply. Supplying that need could buttress our production while providing others with means for competing with us in a triangular trade with Canada and Latin America by which they might earn some of the dollars these areas now earn by supplying some 57 percent of our imports.

At this writing the world economy is in a state of precarious balance. With 42 percent of the world's income, the weight of our economy is so great that changes in our consumption have an immediate and severe impact upon the rest of the world. The Economic Co-operation Administration has estimated that a drop of four percent in US consumption would result in a cut of 25 percent in US imports. The United Nations estimates that a four-percent drop in US employment might increase the dollar gap by as much as $10 billion a year. Obviously, then, a recession here, resulting in part from our failure to retain and expand foreign trade, would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

convert the precarious world balance into a worldwide down-trend by setting off a self-stimulating pattern of declining employment, consumption and trade. The consequent cumulative social and political upheavals would play into the hands of Communists in Italy and France, and of renascent Nazis in Germany, to cite but a few examples, and would force the vast underdeveloped areas to seek champions outside the Western world.

The methods by which trade may be expanded and the dollar gap bridged have been debated long and vigorously. Most of the propositions can be summarized: "Live within your means"; or "Increase your means through unity and management."

The first school holds that foreign countries must get imports down to what they can pay for, and that the way to do this is a strict anti-inflation policy.

The inherent short-sightedness of this view is immediately apparent: US exports would drop considerably. But equally important is its failure to evaluate the economic implications of political developments since the late thirties. Both Western Europe and the underdeveloped areas have undergone a revolution. In Europe there has been a strong and politically effective demand for full employment. Few Europeans would tolerate the burdens inflicted upon the workers of Italy where this theory has been largely followed and has resulted in chronic, serious unemployment forcing the government to spend $160 million a year on social-welfare.

In the underdeveloped areas there has been an equally strong demand for industrial development. The result has been a neglect of agriculture, and, in many cases, of raw-material development so that these have become scarce and expensive on the world market.

An attempt to reverse these trends by pressure, with its implication of indifference to the aspirations of friendly peoples, would severely shake established and projected coalitions against Communism.

Since this view also ignores the fact that Europe, no longer able to exchange its manufactured goods with Eastern Europe for essential food and raw materials, must buy these last from the US with hard dollars, and further ignores the special plight of a Japan cut off from trade with China, it seems justifiable to discard it and turn to the second over-all theory.

The second school maintains that the dollar problem will be chronic until (a) Western European industry becomes efficient enough to compete on fairly even terms with the US for third markets; and until (b) surpluses of non-dollar food can be grown for Europe and new sources of raw material be developed for both the rapidly growing US and the gradually rising European needs.

To increase European industrial efficiency to the extent where it can not only compete for third markets, but also compete for markets within the US, however, there must be created a mass-market allowing the use of mass-production and mass-marketing techniques. The European Coal-Steel Community is the first step toward this goal; essential is an arrangement with Great Britain.

As a first step this theory emphasizes four ways by which Western Europe's dollar earnings may be boosted and its supply of dollars prevented from vaccillating widely so that a steady flow of capital investment, needed to push up efficiency, can be attained.

Point 1 is an anti-inflation policy pushed as far as possible without cutting into current living standards or causing serious unemployment. *Point 2* is the stabilization of certain international commodities such as lead, rubber, tin and zinc by long-term US contracts. *Point 3* is a real cut in US import barriers. *Point 4* is currency convertability, carefully managed, with a large stabilization fund behind it, and not used to force a balance.

With the dollar gap plugged, the theory moves on to what it really holds to be the long-range solution to the dollar problem: development of new resources.

The Paley Commission report estimates the US will have to triple its imports of raw materials in the next 25 years. The non-Communist world is, then, estimated to require between five and 10 billions of dollars of "remuneration seeking" dollar investments per year. But combined US private and public investment has averaged between $1 and $1.5 billion during the past few years.

Moving in as it does to grapple with the whole complex structure of the dollar problem, this second theory would seem to hold at least the elements of an answer. It is, however, full of dangers. It could very easily be oversimplified.

Take the final goal, for example: the development of new resources. There is a truism which says trade tends to follow investment. Consequently, if the US invests most and first, replacement orders will tend to come to us. This would in nowise help Europe and the Commonwealth. In other words, even if a tremendous increase in investment were brought about, the world's supply of dollars would not be measurably increased unless simultaneous action guaranteed other nations a benefit from the created buying power. Each measure, then, is essential; none alone is of any lasting value.

Anti-inflation policies are the concern of each individual nation. There is room for a great deal of improvement in this field, especially in the Commonwealth.

Drastic cuts in US import barriers are our concern, and here again there is room for a great deal of improvement. These barriers are absurd as they stand today; cutting them will add measurably to the world's dollar supply.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, again, this measure alone would be of little lasting value; total US imports of manufactured goods subject to tariff amounted to $1 billion in 1951 and the remaining tariffs are not so high that abolishment could more than double that rate of import. A more probable result would be a rise of around 50 percent. The blunt fact is that the domestic productive facilities and marketing institutions that have been created behind the tariff wall are now so firmly entrenched that it is exorbitantly expensive to start up in competition with them. Again it is a question of stimulating foreign industrial efficiency and of avoiding a recession at home.

Another US concern is the policy of stabilizing our annual purchases of raw material. The Paley Commission reported what we shall need if our industry is to grow. To get it we must invest, but invest in a way ensuring the constant availability of the materials we need. A recession here would discourage increased production of many materials unless we guarantee purchases of them will not be affected. In other words, while taking every precaution listed here against recession, the US could decide in which materials it wants world production to expand, then guarantee that its annual dollar expenditure on purchasing stated quantities of these will not fall below a certain level. Obviously this measure would be defeated by short-sighted pressures at home if we suffered a recession; consequently it only has value when used in conjunction with all measures aimed at preventing such a recession.

The final, crucial and international policy is that of currency convertability. All the other measures here described could conceivably allow the non-dollar countries to stand without aid—but only through the application of severe discriminatory restrictions against US imports. Since such a condition would be self-defeating, special currency arrangements are essential.

History indicates that increase in world trade can only occur concurrently with an increase in world currency reserves—such an increase is impossible so long as the currency hardest to get is the one everybody wants to hold. History also provides a clue to this dilemma: The great increase in national production and trade which occurred during the nineteenth century would never have been possible if the system whereby internal purchasing power depended wholly on fluctuations in gold supply had not been swamped by the happy accident of the spreading check system. Could we not, then, adopt a check system on an international scale? Is not the crux of our present stultifying condition the fact that some imports can only be bought with very desirable currencies while others can be bought with currencies everybody is willing to get rid of?

There has been suggested a system by which the central banking systems of creditor nations would receive payment for some of its country's exports in the form of deposits at an international clearing union. These deposits would be immutable, interest-bearing claims upon other people's resources—*all imports and exports would be paid for in units of equal value.* Membership in such a union would be voluntary and members would not be asked to accumulate more of these claims than they would be willing to hold. A mode of operation would have to be devised which would make it plain that a nation resigning from the union would give up advantages its electorate would not like to forego.

The units of account would be linked to a given weight of gold and balances accruing to creditor nations would accumulate interest from a fund provided by the interest payments of debtor nations. Each nation, of course, would have to agree at the outset to a stated deposit obligation and would be given a stated overdraft facility. The obligation would be high, probably 50 percent of one year's trade or five percent of one year's gross national production. The result would be that creditor nations such as the US would have to take payment for its trade surplus in the only way it can be taken—in imports from or investments in other countries. Surely a better way than our past policy of sending $40 billion in aid and receiving $20 billion in non-interest-bearing gold.

American businessmen would receive payment for their exports wholly in dollars, and the US central banking system would receive payment, as it did before it began giving foreign aid, wholly in claims on other people's resources. The big change would be that non-dollar countries could and would buy more US goods, and that necessary US investment abroad would be facilitated.

The establishment of such a system would present many difficult technical problems concerning such matters as curbs on debtor nations and on creditor nations; but none of these would be insoluble, and the experience of the EPU and other international bodies should greatly ease the task.

Such are the problems we face and such are the theories which have been advanced. They are the kind of theories which always meet with violent dissent, but that seems unimportant if their formulation and expression stimulates thinking free from prejudice and outworn concepts. For our goal today is no less than the creation of a world in which Communism and all other desperatisms can find no breeding place; and the task no less than buttressing our own economy, recreating the producing, investing and trading power of a Europe stripped of colonies, and by these means begin to satisfy the glaring human needs of three-fourths of mankind.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

CLARITY, ELEGANCE, AND POWER

by Allen Tate

THIS SMALL BOOK contains one-hundred *fifteen poems, the best of Mr. Winters'* verse over a period of about thirty years. He might well have included more, for he has as few mistakes to live down as any poet in this country. Friends of Mr. Winters, among whom I count myself, have the right to reproach him for delaying so long this adequate volume, and then to thank Mr. Swallow for publishing it. The size of the company of his peers one need not determine. In his own generation he has the eminence of isolation; among American poets who appeared soon after the first war he is, Crane being dead, the master. If he has been neglected—when he has not been ignored—the reasons are not hard to find. He has conducted a poetic revolution all his own that owes little or nothing to the earlier revolution of Pound and Eliot, and that goes back to certain great, likewise neglected Tudor poets for metrical and stylistic models. The dour polemics of his critical prose and his aloofness from world causes (not in itself a virtue) have set on edge the teeth of the fashionable literary world. He is without manner, but he has a great style; he is of the company of

> Gascoigne, Ben Jonson, Greville, Raleigh, Donne,
> Poets who wrote great poems, one by one,
> And spaced by many years, each line an act
> Through which few labor, which no men retract.

I shall illustrate with a few quotations his clarity, elegance, and power—qualities seldom, in our age, found together—and, at the same time, for my own instruction, try to account for their presence. This quatrain is from "Sir Gawaine and the Green Knight":

> By practice and conviction formed,
> With ancient stubbornness ingrained,
> Although her body clung and swarmed,
> My own identity remained.

To a generation whose nerve-ends have been lacerated by the catachreses of the neo-Symboliste style, the lines will sound flat. Are they not a string of clichés? Not, I think, unless we are so trapped in a literary provincialism of time that we can no longer read for any effect but shock in every phrase. We are like a woman who will not consent to be courted until she has been violated. But Winters, like Yeats before him, is a master of composition; he first deploys a force of "numb lines," and then, at the right moment, produces the explosion. The explosion here is the word "swarmed," but one needs the delicate radar system of a bat to hear it. A woman's body *clings;* bees both *swarm* and cling. The visual image in "swarmed" remains, as it should, undeveloped; we are not asked to see a woman's body as literally a swarm of bees. What we do get is the diffused color of gold and the precise impression that the lover's body is aroused because it has been overwhelmed.

It takes an unviable gift that can only be called genius to use the least figurative distortion for the greatest imaginative effect. We get this in Marvell's "But with his keener eye/ The axe's edge did *try,*" and in Donne's "But leans and *hearkens* after it," in which the fixed leg of the draftman's compasses suddenly acquires hearing. Since men lean forward the better to hear, and the fixed leg of the compass leans, compasses therefore hear; but we are not asked to see, attached to them, a pair of human ears. Winters' "swarmed," like Marvell's "try" and Donne's "hearkens," remains literally submerged; but the controlled connotations are extremely powerful because they are not, in Samuel Johnson's phrase, "limited by exceptions."

I have labored a slight example because without a clear understanding of Winters' particular use of metaphor we shall not fully understand the more complex and more massive effects. To make these effects more accessible one must, after some years of penance, see that one does not read solely with one's intellect, but partly through the prism of one's prejudices, which permits one to see at first glance merely what the prism refracts. We cannot read Winters if we decide in advance, as I once decided, with my mind on something else, that he is a gifted academic poet of the neoclassical decadence (roughly contemporaneous with Johnson)—a view to which some of his critical theories, notably in *Primitivism and Decadence,* lend a certain plausibility. We must try to distinguish what the poet does from what he says he is doing. His theory of the heroic couplet, for example, as a moral agency in poetry, though much is to be said for it, must not be allowed to convince us that Winters himself is a moralizing poet.

His own couplets are not like anybody else's—certainly not like Churchill's or Pope's, which he has acutely analyzed—though they often resemble Dryden's. The closed couplet of "The Grave," one of the most powerful poems, is varied by *enjambement*; an additional formal feature being the grouping of the lines into three stanzaic units of five couplets each. Two determinant patterns reinforce each other. I quote the second stanza entire:

> What has he found there? Life, it seems, is this:
> To learn to shorten what has moved amiss;
> To temper motion till a mean is hit,
> Though the wild meaning would unbalance it;
> To stand, precarious, near the utter end;
> Betrayed, deserted, and alone descend,
> Blackness before, and on the road above
> The crowded terror that is human love;
> To still the spirit till the flesh may lock
> Its final cession in eternal rock.

COLLECTED POEMS, by Yvor Winters (Swallow; $3.50).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The progressive units of attention are the couplets, but the rhetorical unit, the "shape of the meaning," is the stanza as a whole. The climactic phrase, the power of which is similar to that of "swarmed," is "crowded terror"; the single particular detail, the "road above" the grave, locates the scene at one stroke. The stanza holds in equilibrium clarity, explosive power, and elegance of control.

A careful reading of these poems will dispel the generally held opinion that Winters is "withdrawn from life." I have not been able to find in another living American poet as much life *actualized* in language.

There is no other modern American poetry more deeply rooted in a particular American background, more informed by American history, or more sensitive to its natural and human features. The misunderstanding has been due to a revulsion against the point of view that Winters brings to his experience. This perspective is in one of the great European traditions, and it is still, in addition to our own traditions, ours. Unlike the school of Lindsay and Sandburg, of a generation ago, and unlike the recent Marxists, who stultified their intelligence by playing the political shell-game, Yvor Winters is under no illusion that it is his special privilege as an American to invent the nature of man. He is a Renaissance humanist of the pre-Spenserian school of metaphysical rhetoricians, the school of Greville and Raleigh: a poet whose moral imagination takes, without didacticism, the didactic mode, striving for precision in language and, in verse, for formal elegance. "Nor is the mind in vain," he writes. His subject is the dignity of man's commitment to his limitations.

The rational intelligence, informed for us by the Judaeo-Christian tradition, may locate, without wholly understanding, the mystery of its predicament: this tradition Winters seems to accept, *to find himself in*, somewhat short of liturgical belief. Yet his verse is a distinguished refutation of the view that a poet, to be completely American, must be a Know-Nothing; or, what is worse, pretend that nothing was known before him. He has achieved an impressive clarity because he respects the limits of language more than the inner light; a true elegance, because he declines to invite the reader into the irrelevance of his private sensibility; and controlled power, because his insights are not asserted but earned. At least six poems: "A Vision," "Sir Gawaine," "The California Oaks," "The Journey," "The Marriage," and "To the Holy Spirit," I would place with the best American poetry of their century.

IN THE VAST EXPANSES

COURSE OF EMPIRE, by Bernard DeVoto (Houghton, Mifflin; $6).

THIS BOOK is a bright gem of American literature. It received the non-fiction Book Award in 1952. No book was more deserving. *Course of Empire* would indeed have been severe competition for any non-fiction book published in America any year of this century.

Course of Empire is as strictly American as any book that could be written. For it tells of the discovery, the exploration, and the commencement of the settlement of the far-flung regions of the continent. The story is more than the narration of events, more than the conventional historical account. The pages are full of living people—their passions, their humility, their cruelty, their faith. DeVoto has the knack of cutting through "what" to discover "why," of placing the calendar of historic events in the frame of men's motives and ambitions.

Course of Empire is really the first of a trilogy, though it is last to be published. *The Year of Decision* and *Across the Wide Missouri* supply the details for a few of the highlights of the broad canvas of this book. One who reads this book first can get new perspective on old familiar chapters of American history. He can see the compound of the many forces that were at work to discover and subdue the wilderness, their relation one to the other, and the complex of fear, ambition, greed, unselfishness, and plain grit and guts that were the driving forces.

Spain, France, England, and finally the United States were the empire builders. Each used ingenious and often clumsy methods. There were the cross as well as the knife and the gun, prayer as well as trade. Franciscans vied with Jesuits, the British trader with the French trapper, the Spanish with each other, and everyone with swamp fever and Indians. There are many gracious bows to the Indians—the excellence of their crossbow, their skill with birch bark canoes in white water, their political acumen, their mobility in the woods. The movements of foreigners and Indians alike were on foot in the south, the east, and the middle west. The horse was new and the horse-Indians of the Plains were overwhelming.

But most overwhelming of all were the vast expanses. Men marched for months on foot, living on a little parched corn, looking ahead to each ridge as the vantage point from which they would surely see their destination. But each hill showed only more tangled ridges, more shimmering plains. And so the quest went on. The courage of men failed due to fear. Not fear of an armed enemy; fear of the emptiness of the land. The emptiness served indeed as a more impregnable defense than any forts or outposts that could be built.

The search for the cities of gold, the Western Sea, the Shining Mountains, the Northwest Passage was the most romantic, thrilling treasure hunt that recorded history has told. The key to it all was the Missouri River which DeVoto knows as well as his own backyard.

We have the benefit of hindsight and can see the whole master plan that ended with Lewis and Clark. Yet DeVoto builds suspense and lifts the curtain on scene after scene of intrigue, devotion, and failure. There are no dull spots. His writing is his best. There are sentences to read over and over just as one reads Sandburg for resonance and beauty.

Twenty years went into this volume—twenty years of research and painstaking reconstruction. The final product reaches the heights. But it also keeps its roots deep in the soil of facts. And the ingenious maps of Erwin and Raisz help span the centuries that are compacted here. *Course of Empire* is as solid a contribution as has been made to American history.

WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BELLE LETTRISTS

THE CHALLENGE, by Phyllis Bottome (Harcourt, Brace; $4.75). YEAR IN, YEAR OUT, by A. A. Milne (Dutton; $3.50).

FOR THIS RELIEF much thanks! These two books from England will take the reader's mind off the not-so-cold war for a few hours.

Actually Phyllis Bottome's *The Challenge* is the second installment of her autobiography. The first, *Search for a Soul*, covering the years of her childhood, was published five years ago. The third and last part is yet to come. The present volume begins with the writer's adolescence and carries the story into her early thirties.

They were difficult years, though some triumphant and some hilarious moments relieved the prolonged anxiety over her health and her family (whose mainstay she was) and the anguish of a broken engagement. The book ends with the reunion of the lovers and their marriage in Paris, in the bitter winter of 1917.

The story is a moving one, told, of course, with the skill of an accomplished novelist, but revealing a woman courageous in managing her own affairs and with an extraordinary capacity for friendship. The influence of Alfred Adler (whose biography she wrote in 1939) is evident in her judgment of herself and of those she knew casually or intimately, but her friends are not "cases" to her and she uses no psychological jargon in talking about them.

Though Miss Bottome writes, in the main, of her private world, *The Challenge* gives a fine picture of segments of life in far-off Georgian England—the household of a clergyman in an industrial region, the way children were mismanaged in those days, the code imposed on the "gentlewoman," English tourists condescending to Europeans, and (most completely) the macabre existence in the Swiss sanatoria for tuberculosis. There are delightful glimpses, too, of the literary generation of that time—of Alice Meynell ("a tethered angel . . . closed into a narrow space behind the iron bars of a cage"), of May Sinclair surrounded by her Graeco-Roman courtiers, of Ezra Pound whose "disruptive, iconoclastic mind" showed the young novelist what to put into her mind, "and also what to throw out of it."

What A. A. Milne does in the essays which make up *Year In, Year Out* the English have been good at for years: making something out of nothing by doing conjuring tricks with the language. No American writer does this sort of thing today so well, except E. B. White, who does it better. Milne knows exactly when enough is enough and stops squeezing the sponge at the right moment. He can deftly run up a piece on the neglect of asparagus by the poets or the alarming inadequacy of dictionary definitions—*e.g.* "booby" (the bird, that is).

At a higher level of fooling he provides a new ending for *Candida* which reveals what the "secret in the poet's heart" really was. He comments shrewdly on why a modern novelist or playwright is required to have a sense of history and he gives the best definition of light verse I have ever seen. Only occasionally does Milne drop the pose of the benevolent Tory uncle, pottering about his garden and concerned chiefly with his cats and his flowers and the follies of the Labour Government. When he permits himself to escape from the *dolce far niente* mood, he can speak sharply (on the ethics of the Old Testament, for instance) and even memorably, as he does on where the British should take their stand in the fight against Communism:

> Communism will never be a natural growth on the soil of freedom. Instead of outbidding the Kremlin in its own rôle of State provider of benefits, we should emphasize the benefits which the British "working-man" has won for himself: the right to strike; to choose his job; to absent himself from it if there is a race-meeting or a football-match in the neighborhood; to say what he likes about the management from the foreman upwards. Everything which subtracts from this weakens us in the fight against Communism. Every restriction on liberty makes liberty seem less inevitable, its loss more natural and less worthy of dispute.

WILLARD THORP

AUTHOR OF STENDHAL

TO THE HAPPY FEW: *Selected Letters of Stendhal*, translated by Norman Cameron, introduction by Emmanuel Boudot-Lamotte (Grove; $5).

ONE MUST SUPPOSE that the letters of Stendhal in this collection, written over a period of 42 years to his sister, Pauline, and a good number of friends, were, like the rest of his output, a work of literary deliberation. Not only do their merits confirm this impression—everything is lively, and when the mood takes him, ebullient—but he writes in the same character, imposing the same conditions of love. To be worthy of his love, the correspondent, like the reader of his fiction, must share Stendhal's joy in the free use of intelligence, which leads to knowledge of the world. Even his raptures have a worldly tone. There is no such thing here as the self-betrayal for which we look in letters. Everything is in control, including the romantic flights, which may well have been charted in advance. These letters, in short, were intended for publication. But there is nothing wrong in this, and it's an advantage in Stendhal's case—you know at once where you stand with the man.

It is instructive to compare him with Rousseau on this point. Stendhal makes rather little of laying bare the heart. He does not, like Jean Jacques, take special pride in doing so, nor does he run to great lengths to reveal what he would rather not disclose about himself. Stendhal has no desire to go naked. He makes a selection from the experiences and memories on hand, probably invents the rest, and dresses himself in a personality. To be sure, this is a cloak, and many things are smuggled under it, but it's a handsome one, and he would not dream of rending it or smearing it with ashes. The personality he puts on is his pride, as it deserves to be. Nowhere in the course of his confessions is there the secret hope, as there is in Rousseau's, that the reader will disbelieve him or forgive him his sins and remain convinced of his goodness. Stendhal's calculation is much simpler, it is disarmingly frank. He does not seek double credit—for the courage to confess enormities, and for being a fine fellow, after

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all. He is a fine fellow at once, and a clever, brave, romantic, cynical, passionate, dispassionate and audacious one, always intelligent, who sees no reason to apologize for the use of his intelligence, even when he puts it to work in creating Stendhal. ISAAC ROSENFELD

RELIGION AND HISTORY

THE BELIEFS AND PRACTICES OF JUDAISM, by Louis Finkelstein (Devin-Adair; $2). A SOCIAL AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF THE JEWS, by Salo Wittmayer Baron (Columbia; $12.50). THE GUIDE OF THE PERPLEXED by Maimonides (East and West; $4.50).

MOST JEWS will agree with Dr. Finkelstein, president of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, that Judaism is primarily a way of life, and that it aims at transforming all human actions into a means of communion with God. Few people will object to the author's assertion that every Jew, who lives in accordance with the lofty tenets of his creed, is in a position to help establish the Kingdom of God and the brotherhood of men on earth. To understand the revolutionary impact of Judaism on the Western World we must bear in mind that in antiquity the creed of the ruling nation, the powerful Romans, was entirely devoid of such ambitious goals—for Cicero, religion (derived from the verb *re-legere*, to care, to practice) merely meant devotion to the gods, which he and his fellow-Romans expressed through mechanical performance of all required rituals.

A Hegelian would say that the Jews, at a certain stage of the dialectic process, exhausted their strength after their national genius had given the world the first spiritual, non-pagan concept of religion. But Dr. Finkelstein, in his delightful little book—actually an expansion of an essay written for *The Religions of Democracy*, the joint work of three clergymen, representing the three major faiths of America—nowhere suggests that the Jewish religion is a petrified affair of the past. On the contrary, the Judaism he stands for is a living organism, growing and achieving added strength through each Jewish individual. Each Jew works for the achievement of the Messianic Age which will be devoid of any discrimination between persons on account of origin, faith, or any other reason: "The evils of human origin will have been overcome; those inherent in Nature will be mitigated through further knowledge and increased piety."

In the work of Professor Baron much space is devoted to an inquiry into the genesis and development of religion, from the times of the biblical Abraham to the completion of the Talmud in the fifth or sixth century of the Christian era. Inevitably, Baron sees Jewish history as a ceaseless fight between the spiritual forces of Judaism and the obstacles put in the way of Man by Nature. In the present two volumes, Baron demonstrates why Jewish history turned out to be entirely different from the history of such other small peoples as the Phoenicians, the Moabites, or the Philistines, all of whom perished. He knows and he states that "Judaism cannot exist, for any length of time, without Jews, nor Jews without Judaism." In other words, Judaism is as much a creation of the Jewish people as the latter was formed and made immortal by the great social vision that is the core of Israel's creed. Baron stresses more strongly than Finkelstein the fact that the idea of justice permeates Jewish civilization far more completely than any other civilization.

This approach to Jewish history explains why the reader will find in Baron's scholarly books—the first two of a contemplated six-volume-work—that none of the nation's various social institutions and economic struggles are neglected in favor of the discussion of exclusively metphysical thought and ideological trends. Hence, the whole set will constitute a long-needed counterbalance to the only large history of the Jewish people as yet available to American readers, the six volumes by good old Heinrich Graetz from which little can be learned about the violent social conflicts that have raged within Jewry.

Whereas Finkelstein reprints the full text of Maimonides' *Thirteen Articles of Faith*, in Baron's volumes the greatest of medieval Jewish thinkers is mentioned only a couple of times, and even then only in passing. Undoubtedly, his significance will be dealt with more fully in the forthcoming volumes. From even these few references to Maimonides can be surmised that this was a universal mind, that this thinker occupied himself not only with theology, but with such practical affairs of everyday life as price controls, marriage, sex problems, and other matters. In the *Guide*—published in 1190—Maimonides concerned himself mainly with questions of faith, but he did not contemplate and treat them in a complete vaccuum. Actually, he addressed himself to the educated "assimilated" Jew of Spain who had become perplexed in his faith on account of what seemed to him startling contradictions between philosophy (in this case, the Aristotelian scholasticism prevalent in Moslem civilization) and the teachings of the Bible. Being a rationalist, Maimonides believed " in the power of human thought to grasp metaphysical truth," to quote from the scholarly introduction by the editor, the late Julius Guttmann. Maimonides succeeded so well in harmonizing philosophy and revelation that Jewish orthodoxy, considering him a dangerous foe, had the *Guide* banned.

Despite this ban, the influence of Maimonides, who proclaimed that the pursuit of truth was a religious duty, extended to many generations, even to Baruch Spinoza. While a rationalist, Maimonides had nothing in common with those shallow thinkers who, entirely relying upon their minds, believed themselves capable of knowing all the answers. The great Maimonides was, basically, a humble man. Aware of the limits of the human intellect, he warned:

> Do not imagine that these great mysteries [what Maimonides called "metaphysical secrets"] are completely and thoroughly known to any of us. By no means: sometimes Truth flashes up before us with daylight brightness, but soon it is obscured by the limitations of our material nature and social habits, and we fall back into a darkness almost as black as that in which we were before. We are thus like a person whose surroundings are from time to time lit up by lightning, while in the intervals he is plunged into pitch-dark night. ALFRED WERNER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ACCURSED CANINE

A DOG'S HEAD, by Jean Dutourd, translated by Robin Chancellor (Simon and Schuster; $3).

THIS IS ONE of the most curious novels in translation, and surely the most relentlessly tiresome, to be presented to the American public since "Gallic wit" became an importable commodity. Blending caution with a touch of perspicacity, the publishers announce that it will "anger some readers for the very reasons which will attract others," that it is a book toward which "no one . . . will be indifferent." *A Dog's Head* will bore far more readers than it will anger and in either case they will be people incapable of following infinite variations on a feeble joke. It should attract readers unable to discriminate between the witty and the silly.

Our story begins and ends, long before it is finished, with the fact that we are dealing with a hero notable for having been born with a dog's head, a spaniel's head; to be exact—long ears and sad eyes and teeth that can be bared in the approximation of a smile. His adventures from infancy or "puppyhood," (peals of laughter) to the point where he reverts to type or, as the author insists with unflagging subtlety, "goes to the dogs," comprise a life story recorded in double-takes. His parents are surprised; his schoolmates are astonished; his fellow-soldiers are dumfounded, etc., etc. The only unpredictable aspects of his life are those in which, by Krafft-Ebing asides and footnotes, the author suggests that a canine physiognomy and an animal nature might at any moment lead our hero and his acquaintances (men, women and dogs) into real or contemplated bestiality. These parts are naughty, terribly French and not quite adult. Long after the threadbare joke has come loose at the seams, metaphysical considerations and psychological nuances are introduced as if to prove that, after all, our hero is a full-fledged meaning in search of a symbol. Were not the gods of Egypt portrayed with the heads of animals?

To describe the special quality of M. Dutourd's satire on the regimented ways of society and the inhuman viciousness of most people in the face of anomaly, the publishers tell us that readers abroad have reached for Voltaire and Swift. American readers would do well to reach for Al Capp and settle down for the evening. JOHN MALCOLM BRINNIN

A GIANT TO LIVE WITH

BIG BUSINESS: A NEW ERA, by David E. Lilienthal (Harper; $2.75).

BIGNESS, whether in industrial units, labor unions, or government, has become an increasingly troublesome issue for liberals since Justice Brandeis termed it a "curse" a generation ago. Corporate empires have continued to expand despite both doctrinal warnings and legal restrictions.

That Wilsonian liberalism cannot supply adequate answers to the problem of business concentration was revealed by the disappointing recommendations of the Temporary National Committee in 1941. The issue of size of enterprises needs to be re-examined in terms of the kind of world conditions we have had for the past two decades and are likely to experience during the next two.

One recent contribution to such a philosophic re-examination and reorientation is J. K. Galbraith's *American Capitalism, The Concept of Countervailing Power.* This new book by David Lilienthal is likewise designed to change our views and public policy toward bigness in American industry.

Mr. Lilienthal strives to make a strong case for Big Business. He acknowledges the dangers of centralization and depersonalization but puts his faith in such elements of the new business philosophy as decentralized administration and enlightened personnel management.

On the operation of giant enterprises, the author speaks from years of experience as chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Atomic Energy Commission. Nevertheless his book is more superficial and dogmatic than Galbraith's well reasoned volume. Presumably Mr. Lilienthal is aiming at a larger audience, and hence is reluctant to define or analyze carefully.

In the absence of definitions, however, the critical reader is apt to find unconvincing such statements as "we are living in what is probably the most highly competitive society men have ever known," or that there exists a "patently furious competitive rivalry between the major oil-refining companies in this country." Also he will miss an analysis of advertising or any discussion of mergers, patent policy, and intercompany control through stock ownership, such as the stock holdings of du Pont in General Motors and US Rubber.

Mr. Lilienthal correctly stresses nonprice aspects of competition that are of increasing importance and that economists have been prone to neglect or minimize. Expanded research has made product competition more dynamic; the power exercised by managements of large concerns has been restricted and diffused by the development of big distributors, organized labor, government controls, and social pressures. And large-scale business may contribute to our military strength in ways that have generally been overlooked.

The author only sketches his positive program in a few pages. It consists chiefly of public education in the benefits of Big Business and amendment of the antitrust laws to encourage dynamic growth of firms. The claim is made, without adequate supporting evidence, that present attitudes and federal policies bring on "a host of evil and consequences," "cripple our country," and "prevent the full flowering of the advantages of Bigness so valuable to us."

His plea for economic enlightenment and legislative revision would have gained in effectiveness if Mr. Lilienthal had been more painstaking and precise in presenting his position and proposals. Perusal of scholarly writings on competition and monopoly would have helped the author to sharpen his own views.

Books such as this clearly point to the need for a new analytical structure that takes full account of the aspects of American industrial life which Mr. Lilienthal stresses. Only when such a theoretical foundation has been developed will a firm basis exist for formulating and judging a program such as the one he advocates.

RICHARD LESTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE JUGOSLAV STORY

TITO, *An Authorized Biography*, by Vladimir Dedijer (Simon and Schuster; $5).

AMERICANS hate Communists; Tito is a Communist; Americans like Tito. This seeming paradox is of course no paradox at all; Americans are bitterly opposed to Stalin, and so is Tito: the old adage still holds good, that the enemy of my enemy is my friend.

This book, is the title suggests, is an official biography, and must be read with the appropriate reservations. It is laudatory in the extreme; indeed, any similar book about a Communist anywhere in Europe who did not happen to be on our side would be censored out of public libraries in most parts of the United States. The author, a Jugoslav journalist and member of the Central Committee which rules that country, is a lifelong, dedicated Communist, who sees everything in the customary black and white terms. Tito's long career, including his days as an underground revolutionary always on the run, is told in exhaustive and exhausting detail; he is all white, a dedicated hero. Black Mihailovich was a traitor who deserved to die—it is as simple as that. Prewar Jugoslavia is all black Present-day Russia is likewise all black, although a change in Jugoslavia's party line (which isn't so impossible as many Americans suppose) would doubtless make Russia white again.

Meanwhile, we benefit by the revelations about Russian behavior from what was once an inside source. During the war, Dedijer tells us, the Russians showed no interest in the ideological aspect of the struggle, so far as Jugoslavia was concerned. Instead of wanting that country to have a Communist government, Stalin preferred to restore King Peter to the throne. He played footie with the Royal Jugoslav Government-in-Exile and Dedijer believes there was a secret agreement between Russia and Great Britain for dividing Jugoslavia, and the Balkans in general, into spheres of influence. He tells the usual horror stories about the misbehavior of the Red Army in Jugoslavia, including a tale of mass rape, by Red Army officers and soldiers, of the wife of a Jugoslav when the Russians were guests in his house—stories no worse or better than those which came from many other European cities occupied by the Russians in the closing days of the War.

His pictures of Stalin, all based on first-hand testimony, are striking. He shows Stalin's callousness (he urged the Jugoslavs to invade and annex Albania after the war), his ignorance (he denied furiously that the Netherlands is a member of Benelux), his impatience (he burst out in incoherent rage against a servant, who of course dared not answer back, because carriages were not ready five minutes after they had been ordered). The rigidity of Russian control over her satellites is illustrated by a magazine published in Belgrade but censored in Moscow; it went to press, a few copies were printed, and then the presses stood and waited, perhaps for weeks, until the copies came back from Moscow with the changes (usually heavy ones) indicated.

Dedijer insists, by the way, that Russia did not want the Chinese Communists to take control of the country when they did, but preferred a compromise with Chiang Kai-shek, on the ground that open revolution would require too much costly aid from Moscow.

This book makes it quite clear that there was no inherent reason for the break with Russia in 1948, caused solely by the incredible blunders of Moscow in dealing with a small country which seemed helpless to resist. The author tries hard, but to my mind not convincingly, to show that Communism in Jugoslavia is today very different from Stalinism in Russia—less rigid, more opportunistic, more democratic, supported, so he says, from the outset by a majority; in short, he makes it sound like a mild Socialist regime, the middle way for which so many countries have sought. He says resistance to Moscow in the East European satellites is far greater than the West believes, though that resistance may be declining. Though the author would be surprised to learn some of the reasons, this is a tremendously important book, and especially for Americans, whose naïveté is often almost as great as that of the naïve Jugoslavs themselves. BRUCE BLIVEN

ON THE SUBLIME

by Eric Bentley

THE MANAGEMENT of *John Brown's Body* said there were no available seats at the opening and that anyway they would want to talk matters over before admitting the *NR* critic to their show as they thought there was a danger of his reviewing it unfavorably. They were wrong about the seats. I had no difficulty in buying tickets for the opening, and I was willing to do so because of my long-standing admiration for Charles Laughton, director of the presentation.

Though they were right about the unfavorable review, they were wrong about the grounds of it. Apparently a quotation from my *NR* piece on Acting and Reciting had been circulated in some digest. I had said that the Drama Quartet's readings were not a solution to our principal problems in the theatre: that is all. Does the management feel that a favorable review is not assured unless a critic believes reading *is* a solution to our principal problems? Strange, if they do: for in *John Brown's Body* one would not think that the issue of acting vs. reading arose at all. Here is a poem to be read, not a play to be produced. (One might claim that there is too much acting in the performance rather than too little.) We all enjoy the reading aloud of poetry. What we find at the Century Theatre, however, is poetry that seldom manages to be poetry and reading that is seldom content to be mere reading.

In respect of Benet's poem, I can claim to have entered the theatre with that complete freedom from prejudice which total ignorance alone can confer. I have always postponed the task of tackling so long a piece of verse. If I shall now postpone it in perpetuity, it is because hardly a line I heard at the Century struck me as better than pleasant, straightforward, mildly amusing, or moderately forceful. Those whose knowledge of dramatic verse is limited to the dramas of Maxwell Anderson may find Benet sublime but any whose ears are attuned to the melody of Yeats or Eliot will find it pedestrian; and though Benet is more successful with longer units than the line, and the cumulative effect of a page of narrative or character-re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vealing monologue is fairly considerable, he is excelled here by a dozen contemporary writers of prose. Even so, this poetry might be accepted for what it is—if it did not pretend to be much more. What might have been an entertainment proves an embarrassment because of the epic pretensions of form and content. Having looked back to Homer, Benet looks forward to Norman Corwin. It is not only with a Tolstoy's that his historical imagination cannot be compared. It cannot be compared with the best in current American historical fiction—say, *Night Rider* where some of the same problems are more profoundly imaged.

Accompanied by a singing, speaking, and sound-effecting choir, Raymond Massey, Judith Anderson, and Tyrone Power speak what I assume to be a series of the better passages from Benet's poem. Miss Anderson's range is wide; Mr. Massey and Mr. Power have real enough gifts within a narrower span; individually and collectively the chorus functions with beautiful precision; Mr. Laughton's keen eye and yet keener ear have exercised a degree of control for which one cannot but feel a vast admiration. But it is an admiration that remains abstract. The concrete fact is that one is not enjoying oneself. For the actors assume a manner that tells us what attitude we are to take. Explicitly in the program and Mr. Power's introductory speech, implicitly in the style of the performance, we are told how to respond. A modern phenomenon! By this time any concert program is likely to tell us that the symphony we are about to hear will "carry us away" lest otherwise we fail to be carried away; and the result is, we do *fail to be carried away; because we* are thinking *about* being carried away. When a performance tells you what your response should be it thereby prevents you from having that response. Now *John Brown's Body* is presented with such an air of sublimity as even a poem that deserved it could not support. The three speakers spend the evening posing for an imaginary photographer seated rather high in the balcony; when speaking they gaze misty-eyed at the camera; when silent, they gaze misty-eyed at their speaking colleague.

Part of the trouble is that our Drama Trio inhabits a weird no-man's-land between acting and non-acting. As non-actors they come before us in evening dress. As actors they proceed to impersonate soldiers in uniform or Confederate maidens in distress; this is in itself an exciting feature; what is awkward is the transition back into non-acting—or, more precisely, the way Mr. Laughton has them act while not acting, kissing a hand, encircling a neck, sitting in pictorial attitudes under romantic lighting. Why, there is more artifice in this sublime simplicity than in the complexities of regular theatre which it affects to eschew. No scenery, no action, just three speakers and a poem: yet Mr. Laughton so complicates the formula with fancy lighting, grouping, and movement, that I again end wishing that this great artist would accept the everyday complication of the regular article. I know that one cannot dismiss experiments merely on ground of *mélange des genres.* It would matter nothing that Reciting is half-acting, half-reading if its possibilities were as vast as those of the elements unmixed. It matters nothing that Mr. Laughton's work cannot be defined as drama or as *x*—provided it be good. My real complaint is that it is, for this artist, not good enough, and my hunch is that it is an evasion. An evasion of theatre. Mr. Laughton walks round and round theatre like a dog that cannot make up its mind to sit down. He tries the movies. He reads in hospitals. He reads the Bible to schools. Or on TV. He invents the Drama Quartet. He trains a Drama Trio. Meanwhile he falls in love with literature and therefore with Thomas Wolfe. It is all an evasion.

One of the great moments in my theatre going was the moment when, in a hotel room in Paris, Charles Laughton read Bottom's first scene in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* We write about jaws dropping, but that is the only time I actually saw a jaw drop for sheer surprise and delight, the jaw of Charles Dullin. The portrayal of Bottom, like certain passages in the *Galileo* of five years ago, was sublime; and not just sublime reciting; but sublime acting; sublime theatre.

BOOKS

HOW TO GET YOUR BOOK PUBLISHED

Do you have a book-length manuscript you want published? Learn about our unusual plan whereby your book can be published, promoted and distributed on a professional basis. We consider all types of work—fiction, non-fiction, poetry, religious and scholarly books, etc. For more information, write for booklet RP. It's free.

Vantage Press, Inc., 120 W. 31st St., N.Y. 1

In Calif.: 6356 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood 28.

LITERARY SERVICES

WRITERS! TV MINDED? You do not have to be a television writer to write for TV. Outline, synopsis, plot, etc., will suffice. MEAD LITERARY AGENCY, 419 Fourth Avenue, New York 16.

New Republic

One-Year Subscription Rates by Air and First-Class Mail to

OVERSEAS COUNTRIES

Let the NEW REPUBLIC carry the fight against inaction and reaction across the seas. There must be someone you know in a foreign country who would delight in receiving by airmail the magazine that is read and depended upon by thousands of distinguished Americans. If you are going abroad or live abroad you can receive your copy of the New Republic at these fast delivery rates.

AIR MAIL

Subscription rates:
$46.00 to: British Isles; Europe.
71.00 to: Near East; Australia; India; South Africa; Japan; Hong Kong.
33.00 to: B.W.I.; South America.

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

$13.00 to: British Isles; B.W.I.; Europe (except Spain); Near East; Australia; India; South Africa; Japan; Hong Kong.

12.00 to: Mexico; Canada; Hawaii; Puerto Rico; Alaska; Spain; South America.

The NEW REPUBLIC
CIRCULATION DEPARTMENT
40 East 49th Street
New York 17, N. Y.

help your HEART FUND help YOUR heart

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

20 WEEKS for $2.00

As announced, it has been necessary as of March 1st, for reasons of revenue, to withdraw the amazingly successful introductory offer of 13 weeks of the *New Republic* for $1.00.

Yet the campaign for new subscribers cannot be allowed to lag. Nor ought it be more costly than absolutely essential for our readers to continue sending gift subscriptions, as they have been doing in record numbers. Single remittances as high as $100 have been received.

To replace the 13-week offer, we are instituting an introductory subscription offer of 20 weeks for $2.00. This has the double advantage of helping us better to meet costs and extending the time the new reader will have to become acquainted with the magazine before being asked to renew. It is only because a very high rate of full-term renewals is being received that either of these offers can be made at all.

Please, therefore, if you can, send in your list or add to the names already sent. You may use the order form below or include in a letter.

As the "Big Deal" gets under way in Washington, the people need a searchlight for signs of danger. Before our entry into World War I, Woodrow Wilson said: "If war comes, we shall have to get the cooperation of the big businessmen and, as a result, they will dominate the nation for 20 years." They did, but for only 12 years. There was a fearful crash. Now after another war the big businessmen, with their enormously augmented financial resources, have returned. There must not be another crash. But should it be impossible to prevent ruinous depression, then the nation must have ideas and plans such as were developed in the *New Republic* during the twenties to meet the future as FDR did in 1933.

The *New Republic* belongs to its readers. Help support the magazine that is yours. Help sustain the forum that has served and will serve to vitalize American liberalism.

----------TEAR OFF HERE----------

20 WEEKS FOR $2.00 SPECIAL OFFER

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $..... please send the New Republic for the next 13 weeks to the following:

NAME..... NAME.....

ADDRESS..... ADDRESS.....

CITY & ZONE.....STATE..... CITY & ZONE.....STATE.....

NAME..... NAME.....

ADDRESS..... ADDRESS.....

CITY & ZONE.....STATE..... CITY & ZONE.....STATE.....

3-2-53

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED